DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 335 771 EA 023 248

AUTHOR Sick, Paul; Shapiro, Joan Poliner
TITLE Utilizing Participatory Evaluation in a Public School Setting: An Assessment of Teacher Involvement in Decision Making.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; Evaluation Methods; *Evaluation Research; *Participative Decision Making; Participatory Research; *Public Schools; *Research Design; Research Methodology; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Influence; *Teacher Participation; Teacher Response

ABSTRACT

Participatory evaluation is an assessment approach that involves the participants of a study from beginning to end. The evaluation strategy was implemented in a public school district to assess teacher involvement in decisionmaking, determine whether teachers desire more participation, and evaluate the assessment strategy itself. Data were collected through interviews with 12 teachers and 1 principal as well as through results from a survey instrument developed by the interviewees and distributed to their district's entire elementary teacher population. Results from the data analysis indicate that teachers participate in decisions involving curriculum/instruction and student personnel but do not desire more participation in the two areas. However, teachers do want more participation in decisions regarding staff personnel, supervision, budget/finance, and school facilities. Observations made while implementing the evaluation strategy indicate that the participants became actively immersed in the project, explorations of issues were facilitated due to the trusting relationship between participants, discussions of topics were easier because of the participants' broad knowledge base, and representatives of the teacher population felt that the survey findings were accurate. Recommendations for implementing the participatory evaluation strategy include making certain that all participants are knowledgeable insiders. Three tables and a figure are included. (41 references) (EJS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED335771

UTILIZING PARTICIPATORY EVALUATION IN A PUBLIC SCHOOL SETTING: AN ASSESSMENT OF TEACHER INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION MAKING

BY

PAUL SICK

CHAMBERSBURG AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT

AND

JOAN POLINER SHAPIRO

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Sick

J. Poliner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Please address all correspondence to:
Dr. Paul Sick
Chambersburg Area School District
1006 Falling Spring Rd.
Chambersburg, PA 17201
or
Dr. Joan Poliner Shapiro
Dean's Office
Temple University
College Of Education
237 Ritter Hall (003-00)
Philadelphia, PA 19122

Phone: Dr. Sick: w (717) 261-3439
h (717) 264-1325

Dr. Shapiro: w (215) 787-8263
h (215) 735 8284

Paper Presented at the 1991 Annual Meeting

of the American Educational Research Association

in Chicago, Illinois, April 7, 1991

EA 023 248

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Utilizing Participatory Evaluation in a Public School Setting:
An Assessment Of Teacher Involvement
In Decision Making

Abstract

In this study the participatory evaluation strategy was implemented in a public school setting to assess teacher involvement in the decision making process in the school culture. Participatory evaluation is a research methodology in which the coordinator and participants work as a team throughout the duration of the study from its inception to the analysis of the results. The strategy is an assessment approach in which both the coordinator of the study and the participants are considered knowledgeable insiders rather than neutral outsiders. To evaluate the desired involvement of elementary teachers in participatory decision making both quantitative and qualitative methodologies were implemented. The focus of this article examines the application of the participatory evaluative approach within the context of the public school environment.

INTRODUCTION

Problems with traditional forms of assessment, when applied to site specific populations, focus upon whether or not the study has accurately and comprehensively evaluated a particular project or program within its own setting. Asking the right questions as a neutral outsider can cause problems. This is often revealed after the research process has been completed when the participants of the study feel the results do not accurately portray a true picture of the project or its population. This lack of credibility has been discussed in appraising traditional educational projects (Simons, 1985; Eash, 1985; Nias, 1981; House, 1977; MacDonald, 1977; Kanter, 1977), and it also has been considered in the assessment of nontraditional programs in higher education such as Women's Studies (Shapiro, 1988; Shapiro & Reed, 1984; Acker, Barry & Esseveld, 1983; Eichler, 1980; Duelli-Klein, 1980; Westcott, 1979; Daly, 1973).

This study implements the "Participatory Evaluation" approach to assess teacher involvement in decision making in public school settings. The objectives of this paper are four-fold: 1) to provide background of participatory evaluation to place it within the theoretical framework of

qualitative and quantitative assessment; 2) to present the results of a study, utilizing participatory evaluation, to assess teacher involvement in decision making in schools; 3) to explore a nontraditional evaluative approach in which participants of the study become active members of the research process; and 4) finally, to critique the feasibility of implementation of participatory evaluation as it is applied to teacher involvement in decision making in a public school setting.

EDUCATIONAL IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

Numerous critics of traditional forms of assessment methodologies have expressed the need to implement more nontraditional approaches to evaluation in educational settings (Shapiro, 1988; Eash, 1985; Simon, 1985; Nias, 1981; House, 1977; Kanter, 1977; MacDonald, 1977). Participatory evaluation is a nontraditional assessment approach that utilizes the strength of the researcher or coordinator of the study, as a knowledgeable insider, in which trust has already been established through prior contact with the participants of the study or through personal identification/interest with a given population to be studied. It also acknowledges that many individuals wish to be more than the objects of an evaluative study. Some may desire to be consulted and to be interactive from the outset

of the investigation to the end. Although participatory evaluation had been previously successfully implemented in assessing Women's Studies programs in higher education, this study indicates that this kind of evaluative approach shows promise for application in school settings as well.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Background to the Evaluative Approach

Participatory evaluation is an assessment approach which involves the participants of the study from its inception to its end (Merriam, 1988; Shapiro, 1988). The participants and sometimes even the coordinator of the study are knowledgeable insiders. They assist in making the assessment process more credible or valid because of their understanding of the site; and, hence, they know the kinds of questions which should be asked. They also play interactive roles throughout the duration of the study. Additionally, participatory evaluation is flexible enough to use both quantitative and qualitative assessment procedures, depending upon which methods are appropriate for the study at a given site.

Participatory evaluation is an assessment strategy that is an off-shoot of "illuminative evaluation" (Shapiro,

1988). Historically, the illuminative evaluation approach has been implemented by the educational research community over the past two decades, usually in the assessment of nontraditional programs or projects (Shapiro, 1984; Hevey, 1984; Sherman & Lincoln, 1982; Miles, 1981; Stake, 1981; Trimble & Lee, 1981; Harris, 1977; Parlett & Dearden, 1977; Fox, 1976). The strategy was first introduced in 1969 by Malcom Parlett in a Massachusetts Institute Of Technology research study on undergraduate teaching. Since then the strategy has been developed by the research community in which extensive field testing of the process has occurred (Shapiro & Reed, 1988; Shapiro & Reed, 1984; Shapiro, Secor & Butchart, 1981; Trow, 1970; Parlett and Hamilton, 1978). Illuminative evaluations allow the researcher to adapt the focus of the study to a site-specific environment. The process does not conform to most traditional forms of research methodologies within the research paradigm because it is not a methodology, but a strategy. As defined by Parlett and Hamilton (1978),

> Illuminative evaluation is not a standard methodological package, but a strategy. It aims to be both adaptable and eclectic. The choice of the research tactics follow not from research doctrine, but from decisions in each case as to the best available techniques: the problem defines the methods, but not vice versa (pp. 6-22).

Thus, illuminative evaluation is a strategy that allows the researcher the flexibility to adapt methodologies according to site-specific problems that may develop.

Participatory evaluation has evolved from the illuminative evaluation strategy utilizing its flexibility of site-specific focus. The participatory evaluation process goes beyond illuminative assessment by creating a condition in which the object of the study and even the coordinator of the research project becomes an active participant (Acker, Barry, & Esseveld, 1983). The process develops a relationship of trust between the assessor and those being assessed. The strategy draws upon the strength of the role of the assessor as a knowledgeable insider rather than a neutral outsider. The strategy is a process in which both quantitative and qualitative assessment occurs in a highly participatory environment. As described by Shapiro (1988),

> Participatory evaluation is a process allowing for the use of both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. It recognizes the importance of the evaluator's role as knowledgeable insider rather than neutral outsider and facilitates the development of trust between the assessor and those being assessed (p. 191).

Data collection usually occurs through a variety of methods such as interviews, surveys, documents, photographs, video-

tapes and other methods appropriate to the research setting and the problem.

Participatory evaluation developed as a way to deal with the interactive desires of many participants taking part in nontraditional projects or programs, such as Women's Studies, in higher education (Shapiro, 1988). Unlike illuminative evaluation, participatory evaluation makes explicit participants' wishes not to be perceived as objects of assessment as well as their need to turn to knowledgeable insiders rather than neutral outsiders to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of their programs. In this study, this approach was utilized to assess elementary teachers' attitudes toward their involvement in the decision making process in schools.

Background to the Study

The topic assessed during the study focused on two major areas concerning teacher participation in decision making in the school culture. They included: 1) an evaluation to determine if teachers desire more participation in decisional areas within the school culture and 2) an assessment of the feasibility of implementing participatory decision making in the school environment.

Past studies relating to decisional zones of acceptance/indifference in the school culture have been limited and inconclusive. Most of the studies appear to support the assumption that 1) teachers desire involvement in decisions in which they have high interest and expertise (Schneider, 1984; Hoy & Miskel, 1982; Clear & Seager, 1971; Bridges, 1967) and 2) teachers do not desire involvement in managerial decisions (Duke, Showers & Imber, 1980; Mohrman, Cooke & Mohrman, 1978). However, contrary to conclusions of earlier studies, Schneider (1984) found that teachers are desiring increased involvement in managerial decisions. One aspect of this paper examines decisional zones in reference to teacher involvement in decision making in the school culture.

In reference to the feasibility issue, the literature identifies four important facets concerning the likelihood of implementing participatory decision making in the school culture. They include: 1) legal/legislative constraints; 2) teacher/administrative support for participatory decision making; 3) lack of time to implement participatory decision making; and 4) the institutionalization of participatory decision making versus outside agency support (Bredeson, 1989; Turner & Egner, 1989; Maeroff, 1988; Geisert, 1988; Darling-Hammond, 1987, Johnson & Nelson, 1987; Romberg et al., 1987 Fantini, 1986; McCarthy, 1985; Purkey & Smith,

1983; Sousa, 1982; Firestone, 1977). With the exception of the lack of time to implement participatory decision making, the evidence from past studies in the other three categories is conflicting. The second aspect of this study explores issues concerning the feasibility of implementing participatory decision making.

METHODS AND DATA SOURCES

Overview And Development Of Research Procedure

Participatory evaluation is unlike most traditional forms of research methodologies. Unlike traditional methods, the object of the research become active members of the research process rather than passive participants. This involvement exists throughout the duration of the investigation. In this study the members of the research process were all educators from the participating schools. Table 1 demonstrates a comparison of differences between traditional methodologies and the participatory evaluation approach.

When implementing participatory evaluation to assess teacher involvement in decision making, two data sources were utilized. The first data source consisted of a survey instrument developed by twelve elementary teachers and the

coordinator of the research project, who was an elementary principal in three of the local schools. The purpose of the survey was to assess the entire population of elementary teachers in the school district to determine if they desired more participation in specific decisional areas in the school environment. To determine if teachers desired more participation in decision making, a comparison of teachers' current level of participation with their desired level of participation was examined. The second source of information utilized to collect data was through personal interviews. The twelve teachers involved in designing the survey instrument were interviewed to: 1) analyze the results of the survey instrument; 2) to discuss and determine the feasibility of implementing participatory decision making in the school environment; and 3) to indicate how appropriate participatory evaluation was in terms of providing a credible evaluation of the research topic. An overview concerning the development of the research process is demonstrated in Table 2.

Analysis Process

To analyze the data, several methods of analysis were utilized. The fist issue of the study focused on an evaluation to determine if teachers desired more participation in six major decisional areas in the school

culture. To evaluate this component of the study a survey instrument was disseminated to the entire population of elementary teachers. The methods to analyze the results from the survey include the following:

Method 1: The first method of analysis examines the percentage of responses of participants of the study in each of the six decisional areas in reference to the level of teacher participation in the decision making process. Also provided in the analysis are the range of responses according to the descending order of participation. High/low percentage are also highlighted in the results. The purpose of this analysis is to determine general trends that exist with respect to the levels of participation in decisions as they currently exist and as they ought to exist according to classroom teachers. In reference to the percentage of responses provided for each question, the average score for each category is provided. For parsimonious reasons, the average for each decisional area is utilized when discussing the results of the study (See Table 1).

Method 2: The second method utilized compared existing and desired levels of participation to determine whether teachers desired more participation in each decisional area. To make this comparison Chi square correlations were calculated to determine significant movement between

existing and preferred levels of participation. The level of significance is determined at the .05 level. Chi square was primarily used to establish the degree of independence between column A (Existence) in comparison to column B (Importance). The SPSS-X System of Data Analysis was used to analyze the results. Since the system is set up according the null hypothesis, a level of significance at the .05 or less would indicate that the two decisional areas are not independent of each other. Therefore, a score of .05 or less would indicate that teachers do not desire more participation in that decisional area. A score greater than the .05 indicates that teachers desire more participation.

Method 3: The third method implemented to analyze the results utilized personal interviews from the twelve elementary teachers involved in designing the survey instrument. The results of the survey were presented to teachers during the interview process. Highlights and significant points of interest from the survey were reviewed by the teachers and discussed during the interviews. From the results teachers were able to discuss the findings and interpret the results.

Following the evaluation of the level of participation of teachers in decisional areas of the school culture, the feasibility issue of implementing participatory decision

making in the school environment was explored. To assess the feasibility issue personal interviews were conducted with the twelve teachers involved in developing the survey instrument. To analyze the responses from the interview questions, multiple tactics were implemented to generate meaning from the data (See figure 1). Many of the tactics utilized to analyze the data stem from methods employed by Miles and Huberman (1984). An outline of the analysis process went as follows:

1. Counting - Responses to each interview question were counted for consensual opinion to each question.

2. Clustering Of Responses - A content analysis of each question was examined and clustered to help answer the research questions of this study.

3. Factoring Responses - Responses from the interviews were factored according to the research questions. The factoring of wording and phrasing of responses was also conducted to help analyze the results.

4. Noting Patterns and Themes - Using a combination of the processes described above, patterns and themes were noted from the transcripts.

5. Making Conceptual/Theoretical Coherence - During the analysis process of the interview questions, relationships were noted from the literature concerning the conceptual/theoretical context of participatory decision making in relation to the data obtained from this study.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Decisional Zones

The first issue of the study consisted of a needs assessment to determine if teachers desired more involvement in the six decisional zones in the school culture. The assessment primarily consisted of a quantitative evaluation in which a survey instrument was disseminated to the entire population of elementary teachers. The rate of return from the survey was 79%. The results confirmed that:

1) Teachers currently participate in decisions involving curriculum/instruction and student personnel on the consulted and participatory level of involvement.

2) Teachers did not desire more participation in the two decisional areas involving curriculum/instruction and student personnel.

3. Teachers did desire more participation in decisional areas related to staff personnel, supervision, budget/finance, and school facilities. The survey indicated that teachers desired more involvement in these areas on the consulted and participatory level of involvement.

A summary of the results of the survey instrument are presented in Table 3 according to averages for each decisional zone. As demonstrated in Table 3 a comparison was made between decisions that teachers are currently involved (Existence) and decisions teachers preferred to be involved

in making (Importance). Note the results presented in Table 3 are the averages for each category. Several questions were surveyed in each decisional area. Thus, both individual question responses and categorical averages were utilized to interpret the results of the study.

The second major issue of the study assessed the feasibility of implementing participatory decision making in the school culture. In this aspect of the study a qualitative assessment was implemented in which interviews were conducted with the twelve elementary teachers involved in designing the survey instrument. The major findings confirmed that:

1) In terms of the most effective methods for implementing participatory decision making, teachers preferred a committee or representative approach.

2) Most teachers preferred released time during the school day, however, some teachers agreed to make decisions after school or during the summer with pay.

3) In reference to whom to involve in the decision making process, most teachers indicated selecting participants based upon teacher interest, knowledge, and experience concerning the decision to be made.

4) In terms of obstacles inhibiting participatory decision making, there were five major inhibitors brought out during the interviews. They include: a) forced involvement in the decision making process, b) lack of time/resources, c) the principal, d) legal constraints, and e) lack of follow-up to a decision.

5) Teachers in general were supportive of the concept of participatory decision making. However, they expressed the need to eliminate many of the obstacles that would inhibit the successful implementation of a decision.

6) Teachers indicated that the most beneficial aspect of participatory decision making would be to increase staff morale.

IMPLEMENTING THE PARTICIPATORY PROCESS

The participatory evaluation approach was successfully implemented in a highly interactive setting with a group of elementary teachers. When implementing the strategy, the following findings were evident: 1) the participants developed a high degree of commitment to the research project, 2) the exploration of issues flowed easily due to the trusting relationship that was already established with the participants of the study, 3) the discussion of the topic was much easier due to the knowledge base the participants possessed from being involved throughout the research project, and 4) the representatives of the elementary population of teachers agreed at the end of the process that the resources utilized to collect data accurately depicted a valid assessment of teachers' attitudes concerning teacher involvement in decision making in the school culture.

High Degree Of Commitment

One distinct advantage to utilizing participatory evaluation as a research methodology is that the design promotes a high level of commitment with those involved in

the research process. Due to the highly interactive setting in which the participants became involved in making decisions affecting the outcome of the research process, the participants naturally became committed to seeing the process through and seeing that the study was completed thoroughly. Thus, due to the design, the participants became actively immersed into the research process and helped insure a more accurate and complete assessment of the research topic under investigation.

Observations made during this study support past studies implementing the participatory evaluation design in which participants of the study became actively immersed in the research process (Shapiro, 1988; Acker, Barry & Esselveld, 1983). As indicated by Acker (1983),

> In the ideal case, we want to create a condition in which the object of the research enters into the process as an active subject (p. 425).

Evidence of this involvement stems from the fact that all the twelve teachers participating in the design of the survey instrument all showed up for several meetings after school to work on the research project and all of the participants volunteered to participate in the interview process. As one participant indicated,

> "This is a topic that interests me and I think it is important."

On several occasions, the twelve participants that worked with the coordinator of the research project from the beginning of the process, expressed interest in knowing when the results of the survey instrument would be available. On numerous occasions during construction of the survey instrument, several of the participants would call and make informal contact with ideas on how to improve the survey instrument. During one encounter, three of the teacher participants were discussing the instrument in the hallway after school. When approached, the teachers were anxious to share their ideas on how to improve the instrument. Thus, from observations conducted, it appeared the participants of the study became active investigators rather than passive observers.

Another possible explanation for this involvement could stem from the interest of the topic expressed by the participants of the study. Throughout the duration of the study many of the participants indicated that they were intrigued with the topic of teacher involvement in the decision making process. This aspect, the appeal of the topic, could become an important variable to consider when selecting the participants of a particular research project.

Knowledge Of The Topic And Establishing Trust

When implementing the participatory process there were two factors that greatly assisted with gathering credible data pertinent to answering the research questions in an expedient manner. These factors focus on 1) the knowledge of the topic of the participants and 2) the trust established during the research process.

One factor that helped expedite the research process and gather credible data focused on the knowledge of the participants of the research problem. One observation made during the interview process focused on the participant's knowledge of the concept being explored. Both their knowledge of the topic from their experience as a teacher and their involvement with the research process helped facilitate a comprehensive and credible picture of the research problem. Much of this credibility stemmed from the continuous contact of being involved with the research project from the beginning. This initial contact expedited the exploration of issues during the interview process requiring less time to establish rapport and little need to explain concepts to interviewees. Terms such as 'level of participation'

and 'areas of decision making' became assimilated into their vocabulary which made conversing with the participants on the topic much easier. Evidence of this was demonstrated during the interview process when the coordinator began the interview with an explanation of the background to the study and important terms to be used during the study. During the first interview, the participant promptly indicated,

> "You don't need to go over all that, I know what this project is all about."

Thus, through constant contact and interaction, established by the evaluative approach, the participants' knowledge of the topic greatly enhanced the success of the research process.

Another factor that enhanced the study, focused on the establishment of trust with the participants of the study. At the beginning of the research process the coordinator's role as a supervisor of the participants posed a possible problem with establishing trust during the process. However, to alleviate this possible barrier two procedures were followed to address this issue. The first procedure focused on selecting the participants on a voluntary basis. Selecting volunteers helped insure a sense of commitment to the research project regardless of the role of the coordinator. The

second procedure focused on the process used to make decisions concerning how to go about assessing the entire population of teachers. To achieve this a team approach was utilized between the coordinator and the participants. A democratic process was implemented in which the coordinator of the project became more of a facilitator. Decisions concerning the direction of the assessment process was established through consensus with those involved in the assessment process. Thus, follow-up to a decision made by the group became important to insure success to the process and to establish trust with the participants.

Insuring Valid Results

In terms of validity, the primary concern focuses on how the findings match reality. In qualitative research validity is ensured through a variety of methods. One of the strengths of participatory modes of research is the assurance of valid results. This primarily stems from the role of the participants as knowledgeable insiders who have first-hand knowledge of the research topic and the population to be assessed. The research design ensures constant interaction and evaluation from the participants throughout the duration of the study. Thus, the findings are validated

through a developmental process from the active role of the participants. Merriam (1988) discusses utilizing a participatory approach as a means of ensuring internal validity of qualitative research. Merriam recommends:

> Participatory modes of research-involving participants in all phases of research from conceptualizing the study to writing up the findings (pp. 169-170).

In the context of this study both the coordinator of the research project and the participants of the study are considered knowledgeable insiders who actively participated in the research process. Evidence of this was demonstrated on several occasions in which the participants indicated a high level of satisfaction toward the process. Evidence of this attitude is revealed in the following comments,

> "I enjoyed being part of the process. This topic was very interesting to me. I felt the study might have an impact in the next couple of years."
>
> "After we revised the survey it was much better. I did this with a 'book study' and it worked real well. I don't know how else we could have done it."
>
> "I was glad to see this type of questionnaire being developed. We all felt strongly committed to seeing that the survey was completed correctly."
>
> "I was pleased with the final product. I thought the categories and questions were much clearer."

After the interviews were over, one of the participants returned with an additional observation. She indicated,

> "This process is great! It's like going through the process writing program that we do with the students. I wish the students could see our editing session in progress."

Thus, through the constant level of interaction and commitment on the part of the participants, the credibility of the results are strengthened.

Recommendations For Implementation

To help guide the practitioner attempting to implement the participatory evaluative approach several factors should be considered. Based on the observations made during this particular study in a public school setting, the following recommendations are provided concerning the use of participatory evaluation:

1) Make certain all participants of the research project are knowledgeable insiders rather than neutral outsiders.

2) Involve the participants in all phases of the research process from its inception to the writing up of the results.

3) Select participants on a voluntary basis, taking into account such variables as years of experience at a given site, knowledge of the problem, and interest in the topic to be investigated.

4) Ensure that the coordinator of the project take on a facilitative role with the participants of the study. Establish a team approach in which all members play an active role in the project and have equal status as decision makers.

5) Follow-up on decisions made by the participants and do not deviate from agreements established with the team's cooperation.

6) Select a variety of assessment procedures that are both quantitative and qualitative. However, make certain that whatever methods are utilized have the potential to accurately evaluate the population to be assessed from the team's perspective.

7) Make certain the participants all agree to an established time-line to complete the project. Consider the possibility that too little time to complete the study might cause unnecessary anxiety among the participants and too long of time to complete the process might cause a loss of interest by those involved in the study.

CONCLUSION

The participatory evaluation approach, previously utilized with faculty in non-traditional higher eduction programs, was successfully implemented with elementary teachers in a public school setting. When implementing the strategy, the following findings were evident: 1) the participants became actively immersed in the evaluative project, 2) the exploration of issues was facilitated due to the trusting relationship that was already established with the participants of the study, 3) the discussion of the topic was much easier because of the knowledge base the participants possessed from being involved throughout the research project, and 4) the representatives of the elementary population of teachers agreed that the findings from the instruments utilized to collect data accurately depicted a valid assessment of their attitudes concerning

teacher involvement in decision making within the school culture.

References

Acker,J., Barry, K., & Esseveld, J. (1983). Objectivity and truth:Problems in doing feminist research. Women's Studies International Forum, 6(1), 423-435.

Bacharach, S. B. (1981). Organizational behavior in schools and school districts, Praeger Publishers.

Barnett, B. (1984). Subordinate teacher power in school organizations. Sociology Of Education, 57 (1), 43-55.

Bredeson, P. (1989, August). Redefining leadership and the roles of the school principals: responses to changes in the professional worklife of teachers. Research In Education, August.

Bridges, E.M. (1967). A model of shared decision making in the school principalship, Educational Administration Quarterly 3, 49-61.

Carnegie task force on teaching as a profession. (1986) A Nation Prepared For the 21st Century, Washington, D.C. Carnegie Forum On Education and the Economy.

Clear, D.K. & Seager, R.C. (1971). Legitimacy of administrative influence as perceived by selective groups. Educational Administration Quarterly, 7, 46-63.

Conway, J.A. (1984). The myth, mystery, and mastery of participatory decision making in education. Education Administration Quarterly, 20 (30), 11-40.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1987). Teacher "professionalism" versus democratic control. Council For Basic Education, Washington, D.C., 2-5.

Daly, M. (1973). Beyond God the father. Boston: Beacon Press.

Duelli-Klein, R. (1983). How to do what we want to do: Thoughts about feminist methodology. In G. Bowles & R. Duelli-Klein (Eds). Theories in Women's Studies (pp. 88-104). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Duke, D.L., Showers, B.K., and Imber, M. (1980). Teachers and shared decision making: The cost and benefit of involvement. Educational Administration Quarterly, 16(1), 93-106.

Eash, M.J. (1985). Evaluation research and program evaluation: Retrospect and prospect. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7(3), 237-238.

Eichler, M. (1980). The double standard: A feminist critique of feminist social science. New York: St. Martin's press.

Fantini, M.D. (1986). Regaining excellence in education. Columbus: Merrill Publishing Company.

Firestone, W.A. and Herriott, R.E. (1977). Participation and influence in the planning of educational change, Journal Of Applied Behavioral Sciences, 13 (2) 167-187.

Fox, G.T. Jr., (1976, April). Limitations of a standard perspective on program evaluation: The example of ten years of teacher corps evaluations. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, CA.

Geisert, Gene. (November, 1988). Participatory management: Panacea or hoax. Educational Leadership, 46(3), p. 56.

Hevey, D. (1984). The under-fives coordinators: An exercise in utilization-focused evaluation. Studies in Educational Evaluations, 10 (2), 159-165.

House, E. (1977). Context and justifications. In D. Hamilton, D. Jenkins, C. King, B. MacDonald, & M. Parlett (Eds.), Beyond the numbers game (pp.219-221). London:MacMillan.

Hoy, W.K., and Miskel, C.G. (1982). Educational administration, theory, research and practice, (2nd Ed.). New York: Random House.

Johnson, S.M. & Nelson, N.C.W. (1987). Teaching reform in an active voice. Phi Delta Kappan, 591-598.

Kanter, R.M. (1977). Men and women of the corporation. New York:Basic Books.

Nias, J. (1981). The nature of trust. In J. Elliot, D. Bridges, D.Ebbutt, R. Gobson, & J. Nias (Eds.), School Accountability. London:Grant McIntyre.

Maeroff, G.I. (1988). The empowerment of teachers. New York: Teachers College Press.

McCarthy, R.B. (1985). Technology, time, and participation: how the principal supports teachers. Education And Urban Society, 17 (3), 324-31.

Merriam, S.B. (1988). Case study research in education. San Francisco, CA: Jossy-Bass.

Mohrman, A.M., Cooke, R.A. & Mohrman, S.A. (1978). Participation in decision making: A multidimensional perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly 14, 13-19.

Parlett, Malcolm and Hamilton, David. (1978). Evaluation as illumination: A new approach to the study of innovative programs. In D. Hamilton, et al., eds., Beyond The Numbers Game, (Pp. 6-22) London: McMillan.

Purkey, S.C. & Smith, M.S. (1983). Effective schools: a review. The Elementary School Journal, 83 (4), 439-452.

Romberg, T.A. et al. (1987). 1986 annual report to the Ford Foundation: The urban mathematics collaborative project. Madison, WI: University Of Wisconsin.

Schneider, G.T. (1984). Teacher involvement in decision making: Zones of acceptance, decisional conditions and job satisfaction. Journal Of Research and Development In Education, 18 (1), 24-32.

Shapiro, J.P., Secor, C. and Butchart, A. (1983). Illuminative evaluation: assessment of the transportability of a management training program for women in higher education. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 5 (4), 465-471.

Shapiro, J.P. and Reed, B. (1988). Considerations of ethical issues in the assessment of feminists projects: A case study using illuminative evaluation. (pp. 100-118) In Nebraska Sociological Feminist Collective, A feminist ethic for social science research. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellan Press.

Shapiro, J.P. and Reed, B. (1984). Illuminative evaluation: Meeting one special needs of feminist projects. Humanity and Society, 8(4) 432-441.

Shapiro, J.P. (1988). Participatory evaluation: Towards a transformation of assessment for women's studies programs and projects. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 10 (3), 191-199.

Simmons, H. (1985). Against the rules: Procedural problems in school self-evaluation. Curriculum Perspectives, 5 (2), 1-6.

Sousa, D.A. (1982). What ever happened to shared decision making? NASSP-Bulletin, 66 (456), 53-56.

Stake, R.E. (1981, April). The art of progressive focusing. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles.

Turner-Egner, J. (1989). Teachers' discretion in selecting instructional materials and methods. West's Education Law Reporter, 53, (2), 365-79.

Westkott, M. (1979). Feminist criticism in the social sciences. Harvard Educational Review, 49, 422-430.

Table 1

COMPARISON OF TRADITIONAL METHODOLOGIES
VS
THE PARTICIPATORY APPROACH

Research Aspect	Traditional Methodology	Participatory Approach
Coordinator	Neutral outsider	Knowledgeable insider
Participant Involvement	More passive	Interactive throughout
Methodology	Quantitative OR Qualitative	Quantitative AND Qualitative
Research design	Fixed	Flexible
Assessment instruments	-Frequently standardized -Fewer measures	-Site specific -Multiple measures
Evaluation process	Focus on summative	Focus on formative

Table 2

DEVELOPMENTAL PROFILE OF STUDY

	RESEARCH TASK	DESCRIPTION	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
P H A S E 1	1. Goal identification	1. Assess teacher participation in decision making	1. Research coordinator
	2. Establish criteria for selection of research team	2. Qualifications based upon: a. knowledgeable insider b. volunteer c. 3 or more years experience in school system d. teacher	2. Research coordinator
	3. Selection process	3. Twelve elementary teachers	3. Research coordinator
	4. Review forms of assessment instruments	4. Multiple measures that include quantitative and qualitative measures: surveys, interviews, newsletters etc.	4. Coordinator and Research Team
P H A S E 2	5. Develop site specific survey instrument	5. Qualitative evaluation of six decisional areas in school culture	5. Coordinator and research team
	6. Disseminate survey	6. Assess all elementary teachers	6. Research coordinator
	7. Conduct interviews	7. Purpose of interviews: a. Analyze results of survey b. Assess feasibility of implementing participatory decision making in school culture	7. Coordinator and Research team
P / 3	8. Synthesize results	8. Evaluate the results from interviews and survey	8. Research coordinator

Figure 1

ANALYSIS PROCESS OF INTERVIEWS

COUNTING
CLUSTERING
FACTORING
NOTING PATTERNS AND THEMES
MAKING CONCEPTUAL/THEORETICAL COHERENCE

Table 3

A Comparison Utilizing The Average For Each Decisional Category In Relation To Existence And Importance

Decisions Involving Staff Personnel	Chi-Square	Level Of Sign.	Percentage Of Responses: Existence N	C	P	D	Importance N	C	P	D
1. Staff Personnel	9.18	.16	81	14	5	0	16	40	41	3
2. Curriculum & Instruction	17.27	.04	24	34	29	13	2	20	62	16
3. Student Personnel	22.29	.025	17	41	36	6	2	45	48	5
4. Supervision	3.4	.38	58	34	7	1	9	45	45	1
5. School Facilities	7.58	.11	75	20	4	1	6	36	53	5
6. Budget & Finance	6.95	.30	80	13	7	0	5	48	46	1

N = None; C = Consulted; P = Participatory; D = Delegated